arXiv:0906.3128v1 [math.PR] 17 Jun 2009

Zero dissipation limit in the Abelian sandpile model

Antal A. Járai [*]
Frank Redig [†]
Ellen Saada [‡]

June 17, 2009

Abstract: We study the abelian avalanche model, an analogue of the abelian sandpile model with continuous heights, which allows for arbitrary small values of dissipation. We prove that for non-zero dissipation, the infinite volume limit of the stationary measures of the abelian avalanche model exists and can be obtained via a weighted spanning tree measure. Moreover we obtain exponential decay of spatial covariances of local observables in the non-zero dissipation regime. We then study the zero dissipation limit and prove that the self-organized critical model is recovered, both for the stationary measures and for the dynamics.

Key-words: Abelian avalanche model, burning algorithm, weighted spanning trees, Wilson's algorithm, zero-dissipation limit, self-organized criticality.

1 Introduction

The model studied in this paper is a continuous height version of the abelian sandpile model of Bak, Tang and Wiesenfeld [3]. The reason for our interest in continuous heights is that this allows one to add arbitrarily small amount of bulk dissipation to the model. The presence of dissipation makes the model non-critical, [16], and therefore easier to handle. In the physics literature, one recovers the self-organized critical model in the limit of zero dissipation, see e.g. [13]. However, so far no rigorous proof of this fact has been given.

Our setting will be the abelian avalanche model investigated by Gabrielov [6]. That paper focuses mainly on a deterministic dynamics. However, as pointed out

---

[*] Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath, BA2 7AY, United Kingdom, Email: `A.Jarai@bath.ac.uk`

[†] Mathematisch Instituut, Universiteit Leiden, Snellius, Niels Bohrweg 1, 2333 CA Leiden, The Netherlands, Email: `redig@math.leidenuniv.nl`

[‡] CNRS, UMR 6085, LMRS de l'Université de Rouen, Avenue de l'Université, BP.12, Technopôle du Madrillet, F76801 Saint-Étienne-du-Rouvray, France, Email: `Ellen.Saada@univ-rouen.fr`

there, many of the basic features, such as the abelian property and the burning algorithm, remain the same for a stochastic dynamics. Our models will live on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, and for simplicity, we only consider a nearest neighbor toppling matrix. It is not difficult to extend our results to more general toppling matrices.

Due to the toppling rule, the continuous model still retains a lot of the features of the discrete model. In fact, continuous heights are only used to define the dynamics, and the stationary measure has a natural description in terms of discrete height variables. The discrete effects have been observed numerically in [2]. Our main result is that the induced (non-Markovian) process on the discrete height variables converges to the standard sandpile process as the dissipation vanishes.

1.1 Toppling matrices, stabilization, toppling numbers

For $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we write $|x - y| = \|x - y\|_1 := \sum_{i=1}^d |x_i - y_i|$ and we denote $x \sim y$ if x and y are neighbors, that is $|x - y| = 1$. Each site x will carry a height variable with value in the interval $[0, 2d + \gamma)$, where $\gamma \geq 0$ is a parameter. On toppling, a site will give height 1 to each of its neighbors, and lose height $2d + \gamma$, that is, an amount γ of height is dissipated on each toppling. This can be summarized in the *toppling matrix:*

$$\Delta^{(\gamma)}_{xy} = \begin{cases} 2d + \gamma & \text{if } x = y; \\ -1 & \text{if } x \sim y; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, we write $\Delta^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda = (\Delta^{(\gamma)}_{xy})_{x,y\in\Lambda}$ for the toppling matrix restricted to Λ.

We define the sets of *height configurations* in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and in Λ by

$$\mathcal{X} = [0, \infty)^{\mathbb{Z}^d} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{X}_\Lambda = [0, \infty)^\Lambda.$$

A site x is called γ-*stable* in configuration η, if $\eta_x < \Delta^{(\gamma)}_{xx} = 2d + \gamma$ (otherwise, x is γ-*unstable* in configuration η). The sets of γ-stable configurations are denoted

$$\Omega^{(\gamma)} = [0, 2d + \gamma)^{\mathbb{Z}^d} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Omega^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda = [0, 2d + \gamma)^\Lambda.$$

We will also use

$$\widehat{\Omega}^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda = \{\eta \in \mathcal{X} : \eta_x < 2d + \gamma,\, x \in \Lambda\}.$$

A *toppling* of site x in Λ is defined by the operator $T^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x}$, via the formula

$$\left(T^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x}\eta\right)_y = \eta_y - \Delta^{(\gamma)}_{xy}, \qquad y \in \Lambda, \eta \in \mathcal{X}_\Lambda. \tag{1.1}$$

We use the same formula to define $T^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x}\eta$, when $\eta \in \mathcal{X}$. In this case, note that $T^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x}\eta$ does not alter η outside Λ.

A toppling is called γ-*legal* if the toppled site x is γ-unstable before toppling. A sequence $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is called (Λ, γ)-*stabilizing* for $\eta \in \mathcal{X}$, if

(i) $T^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x_k}$ is a γ-legal toppling of $T^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x_{k-1}} \circ \cdots \circ T^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x_1}\eta$, $1 \le k \le n$;

(ii) the final configuration is in $\widehat{\Omega}^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda}$.

Note that for all $\eta \in \mathcal{X}$ and for all finite $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, a (Λ,γ)-stabilizing sequence exists. The number of times a site topples does not depend on the (Λ,γ)-stabilizing sequence, and hence there is a well-defined *stabilization map* $\mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda} : \mathcal{X} \to \widehat{\Omega}^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda}$, see e.g. [5], or [6, Appendix B] for a proof.

The result of the stabilization is related to the original configuration by

$$(\mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda}\eta)_y = \eta_y - (\Delta^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda} N^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda}\eta)_y, \qquad y \in \Lambda. \tag{1.2}$$

where $N^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda}\eta$ is the vector consisting of the *toppling numbers* associated to the (Λ,γ)-stabilization of η, i.e., $(N^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda}\eta)_x$ denotes the number of times $x \in \Lambda$ topples during stabilization of η in Λ. Stabilization in volume Λ can of course also be viewed as a map $\mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda} : \mathcal{X}_{\Lambda} \to \Omega^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda}$.

The *addition operators* are defined by

$$a^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x} : \Omega^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda} \to \Omega^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda} \qquad\qquad a^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x}\eta = \mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda}(\eta + \delta_x), \tag{1.3}$$

where δ_x denotes the vector having entry equal to one at site x and zero elsewhere.

The addition operators commute, that is, for all $x, y \in \Lambda$, $\eta \in \Omega^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda}$,

$$a^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x}(a^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,y}\eta) = a^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,y}(a^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x}\eta) \tag{1.4}$$

This follows from the fact that stabilization is well-defined: indeed both expressions in (1.4) are equal to $\mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda}(\eta + \delta_x + \delta_y)$.

We endow $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{X}_{\Lambda}$, Ω, Ω_{Λ} with the product metric

$$\mathrm{dist}(\eta_1, \eta_2) = \sum_x 2^{-|x|} \min\{|(\eta_1)_x - (\eta_2)_x|, 1\}, \tag{1.5}$$

where the sum is over $\mathbb{Z}^d$ or over Λ.

Given a function $\varphi : \Lambda \to (0,\infty)$, we define a jump Markov process on stable configurations. The action of the generator on Borel measurable functions $f : \Omega^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda} \to \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Lambda} f(\eta) = \mathcal{L}^{\gamma,\varphi}_{\Lambda} f(\eta) = \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \varphi(x) \left[f\left(a^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x}\eta\right) - f(\eta)\right]. \tag{1.6}$$

The above process is described in words as follows: at each site $x \in \Lambda$ we have a Poisson process with intensity $\varphi(x)$ (at different sites these processes are independent). At the event times of this Poisson process we apply the addition operator $a^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x}$ to the configuration.

1.2 Stationary measure, Dhar's formula

As in the discrete case, the notion of *allowed configuration* can be defined. A γ-*forbidden subconfiguration* (γ-FSC) is a pair (W, η_W) where $W \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ is finite, $\eta_W \in \mathcal{X}_W$, such that for all $y \in W$,

$$\eta_y < \sum_{z: z \in W, z \neq y} (-\Delta^{(\gamma)}_{zy}) \tag{1.7}$$

Remark 1. *Note that since the off-diagonal elements of the toppling matrix* $\Delta^{(\gamma)}$ *are not depending on* γ*, the right hand side of inequality* (1.7) *is independent of* γ*. Therefore we have the same forbidden subconfigurations for any value of* γ*. So from now on we use the words FSC rather than* γ*-FSC, and allowed rather than* γ*-allowed.*

A configuration $\eta \in \Omega^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda$ (respectively $\eta \in \Omega^{(\gamma)}$) is called *allowed* if there does not exist finite $W \subseteq \Lambda$ (respectively $W \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$) such that the pair consisting of W and the restriction of η to W is an FSC.

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda &= \{\eta \in \Omega^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda : \eta \text{ is allowed}\}, \\
\mathcal{R}^{(\gamma)} &= \{\eta \in \Omega^{(\gamma)} : \eta \text{ is allowed}\}, \\
&= \{\eta \in \Omega^{(\gamma)} : \eta_V \in \mathcal{R}^{(\gamma)}_V \text{ for all finite } V \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The results of [6, Sections 3,4] imply the following properties of allowed configurations.

Proposition 1. *(i)* $a^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x}$ *maps* $\mathcal{R}^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda$ *one-to-one and onto itself.*

(ii) $\text{Volume}(\mathcal{R}^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda) = \det(\Delta^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda)$.

(iii) Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{R}^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda$ *is invariant under* $a^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x}$, $x \in \Lambda$.

Hence, the probability measure $m^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda$ on $\mathcal{R}^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda$ defined by

$$m^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda(A) := \frac{\text{Volume}(A)}{\text{Volume}(\mathcal{R}^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda)}$$

is stationary for the Markov process defined in Section 1.1.

For $\eta \in \Omega^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda$, we denote by $n^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda(x, y, \eta)$ the number of topplings at y needed to stabilize $\eta + \delta_x$. Then due to (1.2) we have the relation

$$\left(a^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda,x}\eta\right)_z = \eta_z + (\delta_x)_z - \sum_{y \in \Lambda} \Delta^{(\gamma)}_{yz} n^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda(x, y, \eta). \tag{1.8}$$

Averaging with respect to $m^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda$ and using stationarity under the action of the addition operators (Proposition 1(iii)) gives the "Dhar's formula" [5]:

$$\mathbb{E}_{m^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda}(n^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda(x, y, \eta)) = (\Delta^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda)^{-1}_{xy}|x|^2/n =: G^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda(x, y) \tag{1.9}$$

If $\gamma > 0$ or $d \geq 3$, the inverse $G^{(\gamma)}(x,y) := (\Delta^{(\gamma)})^{-1}_{xy}$ also exists and is equal to the limit $\lim_{\Lambda \uparrow \mathbb{Z}^d} G^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda(x,y)$. Note that $G^{(\gamma)}(x,y)$ equals the Green's function of a continuous time random walk that crosses an edge at rate 1, and is killed at rate γ. Similarly, $G^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda(x,y)$ equals the Green's function of a continuous time random walk that crosses an edge at rate 1, is killed upon exiting Λ and is killed (inside Λ) at rate γ.

Markov's inequality and (1.9) imply

$$m^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda \left(n^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda(x,y,\eta) \geq 1 \right) \leq G^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda(x,y). \tag{1.10}$$

In the following lemma we provide an upper estimate for the "massive" Green's function. It is well-known and easy to see that this Green's function decays exponentially in the distance to the origin. We prefer however to insert a proof for the sake of self-containedness, and indicate the power of γ entering in the exponent.

Lemma 1. *There exist $C > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that for all $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\gamma < 1$, and $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $x \neq y$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &G^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda(x,y) \leq G^{(\gamma)}(x,y) \\ &G^{(\gamma)}(x,y) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{C\gamma^{d/4-1}}{|x-y|^{d/2}} e^{-c\sqrt{\gamma}|x-y|} & \text{if } |x-y| \geq \gamma^{-1/2}; \\ \frac{C}{|x-y|^{d-2}} & \text{if } |x-y| \leq \gamma^{-1/2},\ d \geq 3; \\ C + C\log(|x-y|^{-1}\gamma^{-1/2}) & \text{if } |x-y| \leq \gamma^{-1/2},\ d = 2. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{1.11}$$

Furthermore, there exists $C' > 0$, $c' > 0$ such that the reverse inequalities hold with C' replacing C and c' replacing c.

Proof. First note that $G^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda(x,y) \leq G^{(\gamma)}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(x,y)$, since in the Green's function $G^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda(x,y)$, the random walk is killed upon exiting Λ. Next, we have

$$G^{(\gamma)}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(x,y) = \sum_{n=|x-y|}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2d}{2d+\gamma} \right)^n p_n(x,y), \tag{1.12}$$

where $p_n(x,y)$ denotes the n-step transition probability of simple (nearest neighbor) random walk $\{S_n\}$ on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, and where the sum over n starts at $n = |x-y|$ since the nearest neighbor random walk has to make at least that number of steps to reach y from x.

We use that $p_n(x,y)$ satisfies the Gaussian upper and lower bounds:

$$p_n(x,y) \leq \frac{C_2}{n^{d/2}} e^{-C_1|x-y|^2/n}, \tag{1.13}$$

and for $|x-y| \leq n$ and n of the same parity as $|x-y|$,

$$p_n(x,y) \geq \frac{C_2'}{n^{d/2}} e^{-C_1'|x-y|^2/n}. \tag{1.14}$$

Since we do not know of a reference where these are stated in this form, we sketch the simple proofs. The upper bound follows from the large deviation bound $\mathbb{P}(|S_m| > |x|/2) \leq C_3 \exp(-C_1|x|^2/m)$, and the fact that $\mathbb{P}(S_m = y) \leq C_4 m^{-d/2}$, a consequence of the local limit theorem. Taking $m = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, the two imply:

$$\begin{aligned} p_n(0,x) &\leq \sum_{z:|z|\geq|x|/2} p_m(0,z)p_{n-m}(z,x) + \sum_{z:|z-x|\geq|x|/2} p_m(0,z)p_{n-m}(z,x) \\ &\leq C_2 n^{-d/2} \exp(-C_1|x|^2/n). \end{aligned}$$

The Gaussian lower bound follows from a chaining argument: assuming $|x|^2 > n$, let $m = \lfloor |x|^2/n \rfloor$, and let $y_0 = 0, y_1, \dots, y_m = x$ be points such that $|y_{i-1} - y_i| \leq 2n/|x|$. Consider the balls $B_i = B(y_i, n/|x|)$. Then for any $z \in B_{i-1}$, the central limit theorem implies $\mathbb{P}(S_{n/m} \in B_i | S_0 = z) \geq c > 0$. We get, using the local limit theorem,

$$p_n(0,x) \geq c^{m-1} C_2'(|x|^2/n^2)^{d/2} \geq C_2' n^{-d/2} \exp(-C_1'|x|^2/n)$$

Inserting the upper estimate into (1.12), and using the notation $C_3 = 1/\gamma$, we have $2d/(2d+\gamma) \leq \exp(-C_3\gamma)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G^{(\gamma)}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(0,x) &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2d}{2d+\gamma}\right)^n \frac{C_2}{n^{d/2}} e^{-C_1|x|^2/n} \\ &\leq C_2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{C_2}{n^{-d/2}} \exp(-C_3\gamma n - C_1 \frac{|x|^2}{n}). \end{aligned} \tag{1.15}$$

In the case $|x| \geq \gamma^{-1/2}$, the bounds follow from estimating separately the sums

$$\sum_{1\leq n\leq |x|/\sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{C_2}{n^{d/2}} \exp(-C_1|x|^2/n) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sum_{n>|x|/\sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{C_2}{n^{d/2}} \exp(-C_3\gamma n). \tag{1.16}$$

In the case $|x| < \gamma^{-1/2}$, $d = 3$, the bound follows by ignoring the killing, and using [9, Theorem 1.5.4]. In the case $d = 2$ we again estimate the sums (1.16).

The proof of the lower bound is similar, starting from the lower bound on $p_n(x,y)$.
□

1.3 Rational γ

When γ is rational, the dynamics can be reduced to that of a discrete model. Indeed, let $\gamma = k/n$, with $k \geq 0$, $n \geq 1$ integers, and k and n relatively prime. Then the vector $(n\eta_x)_{x\in\Lambda}$ changes by integer amounts both during addition of unit height, and during toppling. Hence the fractional part $(\{n\eta_x\})_{x\in\Lambda}$ remains invariant, and can be "factored out". We define the map $\varphi_\Lambda : \mathcal{X}_\Lambda \to \{0,1,2,\dots\}^\Lambda$, by $(\varphi_\Lambda(\eta))_x = [n\eta_x]$. The discrete toppling matrix is

$$\Delta_{xy} = \begin{cases} 2dn + k & \text{if } x = y; \\ -n & \text{if } x \sim y; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and it has associated addition operators $a_{\Lambda,x}$, allowed configurations $\mathcal{R}_\Lambda$, and toppling operators $T_{\Lambda,x}$. It is easy to verify that (W, η_W) is a (k/n)-FSC if and only if $(W, \varphi_\Lambda(\eta_W))$ is an FSC with respect to Δ. This implies that $\varphi_\Lambda(\mathcal{R}_\Lambda^{(k/n)}) = \mathcal{R}_\Lambda$, and that the stationary measure for the discrete model coincides with $\varphi_\Lambda m_\Lambda^{(k/n)}$. The relation between the toppling operators is $T_{\Lambda,x}\varphi_\Lambda = \varphi_\Lambda T_{\Lambda,x}^{(k/n)}$. Consequently, since adding unit height in the continuous model corresponds to adding n particles in the discrete model, with the notation $b_{\Lambda,x} = (a_{\Lambda,x})^n$, we have $b_{\Lambda,x}\varphi_\Lambda = \varphi_\Lambda a_{\Lambda,x}^{(k/n)}$.

The elements $\{b_{\Lambda,x}\}_{x\in\Lambda}$ generate the sandpile group for Δ_Λ. To see this, note that the order of the group, $\det(\Delta_\Lambda)$, is relatively prime to n. Hence, powers of $b_{\Lambda,x}$ yield all powers of $a_{\Lambda,x}$, and the claim follows.

1.4 Discretized heights, spanning trees

The measure $m_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}$ can be described in terms of discrete height variables. Consider the space

$$\Omega_\Lambda^{\text{discr}} = \{0, 1, \dots, 2d-1, 2d\}^\Lambda$$

We introduce the discretizing map

$$\psi_\Lambda : \Omega_\Lambda^{(\gamma)} \to \Omega_\Lambda^{\text{discr}}$$

defined by

$$\psi_\Lambda(\eta)_y = \begin{cases} m & \text{if } m \le \eta_y < m+1,\ m = 0, 1, \dots, 2d-1; \\ 2d & \text{if } 2d \le \eta_y < \gamma + 2d. \end{cases}$$

We define $\psi : \Omega^{(\gamma)} \to \Omega^{\text{discr}}$ analogously. We define $\mathcal{R}_\Lambda^{\text{discr}}$ to be the set of configurations $\eta \in \Omega_\Lambda^{\text{discr}}$ which are allowed. By Remark (1), for any $\eta \in \Omega^{(\gamma)}$, we have

$$\eta \in \mathcal{R}_\Lambda^{(\gamma)} \qquad \text{if and only if} \qquad \psi_\Lambda(\eta) \in \mathcal{R}_\Lambda^{\text{discr}}. \tag{1.17}$$

By a (γ, Λ)-*cell*, we will mean a subset of $\mathcal{R}_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}$ of the form $\mathcal{R}_\Lambda^{(\gamma)} \cap \psi_\Lambda^{-1}(\xi)$, for some $\xi \in \mathcal{R}_\Lambda^{\text{discr}}$. It follows from the above discussion that $m_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}$ is uniform on each cell, hence $m_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}$ can be uniquely specified in terms of the measures of cells. Let $\nu_\Lambda^{(\gamma)} := \psi_\Lambda m_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}$.

We proceed to give a description of $\nu_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}(\xi)$, $\xi \in \mathcal{R}_\Lambda^{\text{discr}}$. Let

$$N(\xi) = |\{y \in \Lambda : \xi_y = 2d\}|.$$

Then

$$\nu_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}(\xi) = \frac{\gamma^{N(\xi)}}{\det(\Delta_\Lambda^{(\gamma)})} \tag{1.18}$$

which follows from the fact that under ψ_Λ^{-1}, discrete heights $\xi_x \in \{0, \dots, 2d-1\}$ go to intervals of unit length, and heights $\xi_x = 2d$ to intervals of length γ, hence $\text{Volume}(\psi_\Lambda^{-1}(\xi)) = \gamma^{N(\xi)}$.

In order to study the infinite volume limit, we interpret $\nu_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}(\xi)$ in terms of weighted spanning trees. For this we adapt to our setting the Majumdar-Dhar correspondence between allowed configurations and spanning trees [14].

Burning algorithm (Majumdar-Dhar construction). Fix $\eta \in \Omega_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}$, and let $\xi = \psi_\Lambda(\eta)$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} &W_0 = \Lambda, \\ &W_1 = \{y \in \Lambda : \xi_y < 2d\} = W_0 \setminus \{y \in \Lambda : \xi_y \geq 2d\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $t = 1, 2, \ldots$, we recursively define

$$W_{t+1} = W_t \setminus \left\{ y \in W_t : \xi_y \geq \sum_{z : z \in W_t,\, z \neq y} (-\Delta_{zy}^{(\gamma)}) \right\}.$$

The set removed from W_t to obtain W_{t+1} is called the set of sites "burnt" at time $t+1$. In particular at time 1 the sites in Λ with height $\geq 2d$ are burnt.

By induction on t and (1.7), no site in $\Lambda \setminus W_t$ can be contained in any FSC. Hence we have $\cap_{t=0}^\infty W_t = \varnothing$ if and only if $\xi \in \mathcal{R}_\Lambda^{\mathrm{discr}}$ (if and only if $\eta \in \mathcal{R}_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}$).

Now consider the graph $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ obtained by adding a new vertex ω to $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and connecting it to every vertex. Let us call the newly added edges *special*, and the rest of the edges *ordinary*. Now we identify all the vertices in $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \Lambda$ with ω (and remove loops). Call this new graph $\widetilde{\Lambda}$. In $\widetilde{\Lambda}$, every $y \in \Lambda$ is connected to ω by exactly one special edge. Additionally, boundary sites of Λ are connected to ω by one or more *ordinary* edges. We denote by $E(\widetilde{\Lambda})$ the set of edges of $\widetilde{\Lambda}$.

We define a spanning tree $T_\Lambda(\xi)$ of $\widetilde{\Lambda}$. First, for each $y \in W_0 \setminus W_1$ (that is, when $\xi_y = 2d$), include the special edge of y in the tree. Now for each $y \in W_1$, let $t(y) \geq 2$ be the index for which $y \in W_{t-1} \setminus W_t$, and let $t(\omega) = 1$. For $y \in W_{t-1} \setminus W_t$, let

$$\begin{aligned} r(y) &= |\{\{z, y\} \in E(\widetilde{\Lambda}) : \{z, y\} \text{ ordinary and } t(z) = t - 1\}|, \\ n(y) &= |\{\{z, y\} \in E(\widetilde{\Lambda}) : \{z, y\} \text{ ordinary and } t(z) < t\}|. \end{aligned}$$

From the construction we have

$$\begin{aligned} r(y) = r,\ n(y) = n \qquad &\text{if and only if} \qquad 2d - n \leq \eta_y < 2d - n + r \\ &\text{if and only if} \qquad 2d - n \leq \xi_y < 2d - n + r. \end{aligned}$$

A one-to-one correspondence can be set up between the $2d$ directions of the ordinary edges and the values $\{0, 1, \ldots, 2d-1\}$. This induces a one-to-one correspondence between the $r(y)$ ordinary edges and the values $\{2d - n, \ldots, 2d - n + r - 1\}$. Include in $T_\Lambda(\xi)$ the ordinary edge $\{z, y\}$ corresponding to the value of ξ_y. Since each vertex in W_t is connected to a unique vertex in W_{t-1}, $T_\Lambda(\xi)$ is a spanning tree. It follows by construction that the mapping

$$T_\Lambda : \xi \mapsto T_\Lambda(\xi)$$

is one-to-one and onto the set of spanning trees of $\widetilde{\Lambda}$.

Let $\mu_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}$ denote the distribution on $\{0,1\}^{E(\widetilde{\Lambda})}$ under which a spanning tree t has weight $\gamma^{N(t)}/\det(\Delta_\Lambda^{(\gamma)})$, where $N(t)$ is the number of special edges in t. By construction, for each cell $N(T_\Lambda(\xi)) = N(\xi)$, and therefore, by (1.18),

$$\mu_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}(T_\Lambda(\xi)) = \frac{\gamma^{N(\xi)}}{\det(\Delta_\Lambda^{(\gamma)})} = \nu_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}(\xi) = m_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}(\psi_\Lambda^{-1}(\xi)).$$

2 The stationary measure of the dissipative model

We can view $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ as a weighted network, where ordinary edges have weight 1, and special edges have weight γ. Then $\mu_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}$ is the weighted spanning tree measure on this network, that is, the measure where the probability of a tree is proportional to the product of the weights of the edges it contains. Wilson's algorithm [17] can be used to sample from this distribution. This is described as follows. For a path σ, we denote by $LE(\sigma)$ its loop-erasure, that is the path obtained by removing loops from σ chronologically. Consider the network random walk on $\widetilde{\Lambda}$, that is, the reversible Markov chain that makes jumps with probabilities proportional to the weights. Let $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\omega\}$, and let $x_1, \dots, x_K$ be an enumeration of the vertices in Λ. If $\mathcal{F}_{j-1}$ has been defined, start a network random walk from x_j, and run it until it first hits $\mathcal{F}_{j-1}$. Let σ_j be the path obtained, and let $\mathcal{F}_j = \mathcal{F}_{j-1} \cup LE(\sigma_j)$. By Wilson's theorem, $\mathcal{F}_K$ is a tree with the stated distribution.

Let $\gamma \geq 0$. By the ideas in [4, Section 5], for any exhaustion $\Lambda_1 \subseteq \Lambda_2 \subseteq \dots$ of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, the weak limit

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mu_{\Lambda_n}^{(\gamma)} =: \mu^{(\gamma)} \tag{2.1}$$

exists. We will be interested in sampling from $\mu^{(\gamma)}$ when $\gamma > 0$. For this, Wilson's algorithm can be used. When $\gamma = 0$, $d \geq 3$, this is the statement of [4, Theorem 5.1]. The algorithm in this case uses simple random walk, and the "root" is at infinity. When $\gamma > 0$, the algorithm uses the network random walk on $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}^d}$, stopped when it hits ω. The tree generated by the algorithm then gives a sample from $\mu^{(\gamma)}$. To see the convergence (2.1), couple the algorithms in $\widetilde{\Lambda}_n$ and $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}^d}$, starting walks at a fixed finite number of sites $x_1, \dots, x_k$. The network random walks can be coupled until the first time the boundary of Λ_n is hit. The coupling shows that the joint distribution of $(LE(\sigma_1), \dots, LE(\sigma_k))$ in $\widetilde{\Lambda}_n$ converges as $n \to \infty$ to the joint distribution in $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}^d}$. Since this information determines all finite dimensional distributions of the spanning tree, the claim (2.1) is proven.

Under $\mu^{(\gamma)}$, there is a unique path π_x in the tree from x to ω. Similarly, there is a unique path $\pi_{\Lambda,x}$ under $\mu_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}$. Let us write $\mathcal{P}_x$ for the set of self-avoiding paths from x to ω in $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}^d}$, and $\mathcal{N}_x = \{y : |y-x| \leq 1\}$. ¿From the correspondence T_Λ we obtain:

Lemma 2. *Under the map T_Λ^{-1}, the height ξ_x is a function of $\{\pi_{\Lambda,y}\}_{y\in\mathcal{N}_x}$ only.*

Lemma 3. *For any $\gamma > 0$, and any exhaustion $\Lambda_1 \subseteq \Lambda_2 \subseteq \dots$ of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, we have the unique weak limit*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \nu^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda_n} =: \nu^{(\gamma)}.$$

Moreover, for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, there is a map $h_x : \prod_{y\in\mathcal{N}_x} \mathcal{P}_y \to \{0, 1, \dots, 2d\}$, such that the law of $\{\xi_x\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ under $\nu^{(\gamma)}$ is the same as the law of $\{h_x(\pi_y : y \in \mathcal{N}_x)\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$.

Proof. Coupling Wilson's algorithm in $\widetilde{\Lambda}_n$ and $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}^d}$, we get that the joint distribution of $(\pi_{\Lambda_n,x_1}, \dots, \pi_{\Lambda_n,x_k})$ converges to the joint distribution of $(\pi_{x_1}, \dots, \pi_{x_k})$. This and Lemma 2 shows that for any $x_1, \dots, x_k$, the joint distribution of $(\xi_{x_1}, \dots, \xi_{x_k})$ under $\nu^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda_n}$, converges to a limit, and it has the form stated. □

For the next lemma, we make $m^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda$ into a measure on $\Omega^{(\gamma)}$ via the inclusion map $i : \Omega^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda \to \Omega^{(\gamma)}$, where

$$i(\eta)_x = \begin{cases} \eta_x & \text{if } x \in \Lambda; \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \Lambda. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 4. *For any $\gamma > 0$, and any exhaustion $\Lambda_1 \subseteq \Lambda_2 \subseteq \dots$ of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, the weak limit*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} m^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda_n} =: m^{(\gamma)}$$

exists, and we have $m^{(\gamma)}(\mathcal{R}^{(\gamma)}) = 1$.

Proof. Recall the fact that $m^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda$ is uniform on (γ, Λ)-cells. Therefore, under the measure $m^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda$ and conditioned on the value of $\xi = \psi_\Lambda(\eta) \in \Omega^{\text{discr}}_\Lambda$, the random variables $\{\eta_y - \xi_y\}_{y\in\Lambda}$ are (conditionally) independent, with distribution

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta_y - \xi_y \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1) \quad \text{for } y \text{ with } 0 \le \xi_y \le 2d - 1; \\ &\eta_y - \xi_y \sim \text{Uniform}(0, \gamma) \quad \text{for } y \text{ with } \xi_y = 2d. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Now let $V \subseteq \Lambda$. Then the above implies that if we condition on the values of $\{\xi_y\}_{y\in V}$ only, then $\{\eta_y - \xi_y\}_{y\in V}$ still has the conditional joint distribution in (2.2) (under $m^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda$). This, and Lemma 3 imply that the joint law of $\{\eta_y\}_{y\in V}$ under $m^{(\gamma)}_{\Lambda_n}$ converges weakly as $n \to \infty$, in the space $\Omega^{(\gamma)}_V$. In fact, the limit distribution also satisfies (2.2).

This proves the weak convergence statement. Finally, the limit gives probability 1 to the event $\{\eta_V \in \mathcal{R}^{(\gamma)}_V\}$ for any finite V, because

$$m^{(\gamma)}_W \left(\{\eta : \eta_V \in \mathcal{R}^{(\gamma)}_V\}\right) = 1$$

for all $W \supset V$. □

We now prove that for dissipation $\gamma > 0$, we have exponential decay of correlations of local observables. In [11] this was shown for large enough dissipation, in the discrete case.

By a *local function*, we mean a function $f : \Omega^{\text{discr}} \to \mathbb{R}$ (respectively $f : \Omega^{(\gamma)} \to \mathbb{R}$) such that f depends only on coordinates in a finite set $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$.

Theorem 1. *For all $\gamma > 0$, there exist $C = C^{(\gamma)}, c > 0$, such that for all bounded local functions $f, g : \Omega^{\mathrm{discr}} \to \mathbb{R}$ with dependence sets A, B, we have*

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\nu^{(\gamma)}}[fg] - \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{(\gamma)}}[f]\mathbb{E}_{\nu^{(\gamma)}}[g]| \le C|A||B|\|f\|_\infty \|g\|_\infty \exp(-c\sqrt{\gamma}\,\mathrm{dist}(A,B)). \qquad (2.3)$$

The same statement holds for the measure $m^{(\gamma)}$.

Proof. First consider the case when f depends only on ξ_x, and g only on ξ_y. Then by Lemma 3, f and g depend on the paths $\{\pi_z\}_{z\in\mathcal{N}_x}$, and $\{\pi_w\}_{w\in\mathcal{N}_y}$, respectively. Use Wilson's algorithm starting with the vertices in $\mathcal{N}_x$ and then using the vertices in $\mathcal{N}_y$. We couple the random walks appearing in the algorithm to a new set of random walks $\{S'_w\}_{w\in\mathcal{N}_y}$ as follows: $S'_w = S_w$ until the path hits $\{\omega\} \cup (\cup_{z\in\mathcal{N}_x}\pi_z)$, and it moves independently afterwards. Let $\{\pi'_w\}_{w\in\mathcal{N}_y}$ be the paths created by Wilson's algorithm started from $\mathcal{N}_y$, using the S'_w's. Let g' be a copy of g that is the function of $\{\pi'_w : w \in \mathcal{N}_y\}$. Then the left hand side of (2.3) equals $\mathbb{E}[f(g - g')]$. This is bounded by $2\|f\|_\infty\|g\|_\infty$ times the probability that $g \neq g'$. The latter is bounded by the probability that the random walks used for g do not intersect any of the random walks used for f. This is bounded by

$$\sum_{z\in\mathcal{N}_x}\sum_{w\in\mathcal{N}_y}\sum_{u\in\mathbb{Z}^d} G^{\mathrm{discr}}(z,u)G^{\mathrm{discr}}(w,u), \qquad (2.4)$$

where G^{discr} is the Green's function for the discrete time walk that steps to each neighbor with probability $1/(2d+\gamma)$ and to ω with probability $\gamma/(2d+\gamma)$. Hence we obtain (2.3) from (1.11).

In the general case, we can repeat the argument with the vertices in $\mathcal{M}_f = \cup_{x\in A}\mathcal{N}_x$ and $\mathcal{M}_g = \cup_{y\in B}\mathcal{N}_y$. This leads to an estimate similar to (2.4), where now we sum over $z \in \mathcal{M}_f$ and $w \in \mathcal{M}_g$. This implies the claim.

Let us prove the statement for the continuous model. Due to the representation (2.2), if we set

$$f_0(\xi) = \mathbb{E}_{m^{(\gamma)}}[f(\eta)|\psi(\eta)_{A\cup B} = \xi_{A\cup B}]$$
$$g_0(\xi) = \mathbb{E}_{m^{(\gamma)}}[g(\eta)|\psi(\eta)_{A\cup B} = \xi_{A\cup B}]$$

then we have $\mathbb{E}_{m^{(\gamma)}}[f(\eta)g(\eta)] = \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{(\gamma)}}[f_0(\xi)g_0(\xi)]$, $\mathbb{E}_{m^{(\gamma)}}[f(\eta)] = \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{(\gamma)}}[f_0(\xi)]$ and $\mathbb{E}_{m^{(\gamma)}}[g(\eta)] = \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{(\gamma)}}[g_0(\xi)]$. Now we can apply the discrete result to f_0 and g_0. □

Remark 2. *Theorem 1 shows that in the system with dissipation γ, the "correlation length" scales as $1/\sqrt{\gamma}$ (as $\gamma \to 0$). A natural length associated to the system with dissipation γ is the size (diameter) of a typical wave. Using a two-component spanning tree representation, one can show that (see section 7 of [8] for more details), starting from a configuration chosen from the stationary measure $m^{(\gamma)}$, the probability that a typical wave contains x has the same asymptotic behavior (for large $|x|$) as the probability that a loop-erased random walk starting at x, and killed at rate γ ever reaches 0. This probability equals $G^{(\gamma)}(0,x)/G^{(\gamma)}(0,0)$, which decays (up to polynomial factors) as $e^{-|x|/\xi(\gamma)}$ with $\xi(\gamma) = C/\sqrt{\gamma}$ by lemma 1. So we can think of $1/\sqrt{\gamma}$ as the "typical wave-size" as $\gamma \to 0$ (or "avalanche-size", which is the same, because the number of waves is of order 1).*

The non-dissipative discrete sandpile measure $\nu = \nu^{(0)}$ was constructed in [1] and [8, Appendix], as the weak limit of $\nu_\Lambda^{(0)}$.

Proposition 2. *We have* $\lim_{\gamma\to 0}\nu^{(\gamma)} = \nu^{(0)}$, *and* $\lim_{\gamma\to 0} m^{(\gamma)} = m^{(0)}$.

Proof. For $\xi_\Lambda \in \Omega_\Lambda^{\mathrm{discr}}$ chosen from $\nu_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}$, consider the random field of maximal heights $\{h_{\Lambda,x}\}_{x\in\Lambda} := \{I[\xi_{\Lambda,x} = 2d]\}_{x\in\Lambda}$, and the random set $H_\Lambda = \{x \in \Lambda : h_{\Lambda,x} = 1\}$. Due to the correspondence T_Λ, $\mathbb{P}(x \in H_\Lambda)$ equals the probability that the special edge containing x is included in $T_\Lambda(\xi)$. Using Wilson's algorithm started at x and (1.18), we see that this probability vanishes in the limit $\gamma \to 0$, uniformly in Λ. Hence for any finite $V \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\mathbb{P}(H_\Lambda \cap V = \varnothing)$ goes to 1 as $\gamma \to 0$, uniformly in Λ.

By Remark 1, after removal of the sites with $\xi_{\Lambda,x} = 2d$, the joint distribution of the heights of the remaining sites is uniform on allowed configurations with heights in $\{0, 1, \dots, 2d-1\}$. Therefore, given H_Λ, the conditional distribution of $\{\xi_{\Lambda,x}\}_{x\in\Lambda\setminus H_\Lambda}$ is given by $\nu_{\Lambda\setminus H_\Lambda}^{(0)}$, the non-dissipative sandpile measure in $\Lambda\setminus H_\Lambda$. Due to the convergence $\nu_W^{(0)} \to \nu^{(0)}$, as $W \uparrow \mathbb{Z}^d$, for large V and on the event $\{H_\Lambda \cap V = \varnothing\}$ the conditional distribution is close to $\nu^{(0)}$, uniformly in H_Λ and $\Lambda \supset V$. The above observations imply that as $\gamma \to 0$ and $\Lambda \to \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\nu_\Lambda^{(\gamma)} \to \nu^{(0)}$. This implies the first statement of the Proposition.

For the second statement, we again use the representation (2.2). Then the convergence of finite-dimensional distributions follows from the first part of the Proposition. Tightness holds trivially since all the measures under consideration have support contained in (the same) compact set. $\square$

Remark 3. *The process* $\{h_x\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ *is in fact a determinantal process [10], that is there exists a kernel* $K(x,y)$, *such that for* $n \geq 1$ *and distinct* $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\mathbb{P}(h_{x_1} = 1, \dots, h_{x_n} = 1) = \det(K(x_i, x_j))_{i,j=1}^n.$$

This follows from the Transfer Current Theorem [4, Section 4] applied to the collection of special edges.

3 The dynamics of the dissipative model

Let $\varphi : \mathbb{Z}^d \to (0,\infty)$ be a bounded function, and let $(N_t^\varphi)_{t\geq 0} := \{N_{x,t}^\varphi\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d, t\geq 0}$ be a collection of independent Poisson processes, where $(N_{x,t}^\varphi)_{t\geq 0}$ has rate $\varphi(x)$. We assume these are defined on a probability space $(X, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. We want to define the dynamics $\{\eta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ of the dissipative model for an initial configuration η_0 as the result of stabilizing $\eta_0 + N_t^\varphi$. That this is well-defined is the result of the next two lemmas.

First we consider stabilization of infinite configurations. Fix $\eta \in \mathcal{X}$, and a sequence $x_1, x_2, \dots$ of γ-legal topplings.

Definition 1. *A sequence* $x_1, x_2, \dots$ *of* γ*-legal topplings of a configuration* η *is called* exhaustive, *if for every* $n \in \mathbb{N}$, *and for every* γ*-unstable site* x *of* $T_{x_n} \circ \dots \circ T_{x_1}(\eta)$, *there exists* $m > n$ *such that* $x_m = x$. *A sequence* $x_1, x_2, \dots$ *of* γ*-legal topplings of a configuration* η *is called* stabilizing *it the limit* $\lim_{n\to\infty} T_{x_n} \circ \dots \circ T_{x_1}(\eta)$ *is* γ*-stable.*

Note that every stabilizing sequence is exhaustive and if the configuration is γ-stabilizable, every exhaustive sequence is stabilizing.

Just as in the finite case, the number of times each site topples in an exhaustive sequence (which may be infinite) is independent of the sequence (see [7, Lemma 4.1] for a proof). It can also be seen the same way that if $y_1, y_2, \ldots$ is another γ-legal sequence of topplings, then each site topples at most as many times as in an exhaustive sequence. Call

$$(N^{(\gamma)}\eta)_x = \text{the number of times } x \text{ topples in an exhaustive sequence.}$$

We say that $\eta \in \mathcal{X}$ is *γ-stabilizable*, if $(N^{(\gamma)}\eta)_x < \infty$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. In this case, we denote the stabilization by

$$\mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\eta) = \eta - \Delta^{(\gamma)} N^{(\gamma)}\eta.$$

Recall that $(N_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}\eta)_x$ denotes the number of times $x \in \Lambda$ topples during stabilization in Λ.

Lemma 5. *Let $\gamma \geq 0$, $\eta \in \mathcal{X}$.*
(i)The function $N_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}(\eta)$ is monotone increasing in Λ and η.
(ii) If η is γ-stabilizable, we have $N^{(\gamma)}(\eta)_x = \sup_\Lambda N_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}(\eta)_x$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.
(iii) If η is γ-stabilizable, we have $\mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\eta) = \lim_\Lambda \mathcal{S}_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}(\eta) \in \Omega^{(\gamma)}$.
(iv) If $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathcal{X}$, and $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2$ is γ-stabilizable, then we have

$$\mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\zeta_1 + \zeta_2) = \mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\zeta_1) + \zeta_2). \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. (i) Consider $\Lambda \subseteq \Lambda'$. Stabilize first η in Λ, and record the amount of height flowing out of Λ. Now stabilize in Λ', with further topplings, if necessary. To prove the other statement, consider $\eta \leq \eta'$. Stabilize first η. Adding height $\eta' - \eta$ does not affect the legality of the sequence of topplings. Hence we can stabilize η' by further topplings if necessary.

(ii) Fix a sequence $\Lambda_1 \subseteq \Lambda_2 \subseteq \ldots$ such that $\cup_k \Lambda_k = \mathbb{Z}^d$. Stabilize η in Λ_1, then in Λ_2, and so on. We thus get an exhaustive sequence, and each site x topples $\sup_\Lambda (N_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}\eta)_x$ times.

(iii) Note that if η is γ-stabilizable, we have $N^{(\gamma)}\eta = \lim_\Lambda (N_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}\eta)$, and hence by (1.2)

$$\mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\eta) = \eta - \Delta^{(\gamma)} N^{(\gamma)}\eta = \lim_\Lambda \left[\eta - \Delta^{(\gamma)} N_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}\eta\right] = \lim_\Lambda \mathcal{S}_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}(\eta).$$

(iv) This is essentially not more than the Abelian property. However, since there can be infinitely many topplings in stabilizing ζ_1, care needs to be taken. Note that $\zeta_1 \leq \zeta_1 + \zeta_2$ implies that any legal sequence for ζ_1 is legal for $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2$ as well. In particular, ζ_1 is also γ-stabilizable. Fix a stabilizing sequence $y_1, y_2, \ldots$ for ζ_1. We now construct an exhaustive sequence for $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2$. Fix again $\Lambda_1 \subseteq \Lambda_2 \subseteq \ldots$. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_+\Lambda &= \{x \in \Lambda^c : \exists y \in \Lambda \text{ such that } x \sim y\}; \\ \partial_-\Lambda &= \{y \in \Lambda : \exists x \in \Lambda^c \text{ such that } x \sim y\}; \\ \overline{\Lambda} &= \Lambda \cup \partial_+\Lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Let m_1 be an index such that for all $y \in \overline{\Lambda_1}$

$$|\{1 \le k \le m_1 : y_k = y\}| = (N^{(\gamma)}\zeta_1)_y.$$

Note that $y_1, \dots, y_{m_1}$ is γ-legal for $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2$. Now stabilize $T_{y_{m_1}} \circ \dots T_{y_1}(\zeta_1 + \zeta_2)$ in $\Lambda_1 \setminus \partial_- \Lambda_1$, recording the amount of height flowing out of $\Lambda_1 \setminus \partial_- \Lambda_1$. This leads to potential further topplings in $\Lambda_1 \setminus \partial_- \Lambda_1$ at $z_1, \dots, z_{n_1}$. By construction, $y_1, \dots, y_{m_1}, z_1, \dots, z_{n_1}$ is γ-legal for $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2$, and $z_1, \dots, z_{n_1}$ is γ-legal for $\mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\zeta_1) + \zeta_2$. Moreover, the configuration in $\Lambda_1 \setminus \partial_- \Lambda_1$ after topplings at $y_1, \dots, y_{m_1}, z_1, \dots, z_{n_1}$ coincides with the stabilization of $\mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\zeta_1) + \zeta_2$ in $\Lambda_1 \setminus \partial_- \Lambda_1$.

Now select an index $m_2 \ge m_1$ such that for all $y \in \overline{\Lambda_2}$

$$|\{1 \le k \le m_2 : y_k = y\}| = (N^{(\gamma)}\zeta_1)_y.$$

Since the topplings at $z_1, \dots, z_{n_1}$ do not change the configuration in Λ_1^c, the sequence

$$y_1, \dots, y_{m_1}, z_1, \dots, z_{n_1}, y_{m_1+1}, \dots, y_{m_2}$$

is γ-legal for $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2$. Now we stabilize in $\Lambda_2 \setminus \partial_- \Lambda_2$ via topplings at $z_{n_1+1}, \dots, z_{n_2}$. Again by construction,

$$y_1, \dots, y_{m_1}, z_1, \dots, z_{n_1}, y_{m_1+1}, \dots, y_{m_2}, z_{n_1+1}, \dots, z_{n_2}$$

is γ-legal for $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2$, and

$$z_1, \dots, z_{n_1}, z_{n_1+1}, \dots, z_{n_2}$$

is γ-legal for $\mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\zeta_1) + \zeta_2$. Continuing this argument, we obtain an interlacement of two sequences $y_1, y_2, \dots$ and $z_1, z_2, \dots$ which is exhaustive for $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2$, and hence its final result is $\mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\zeta_1 + \zeta_2)$. On the other hand, the configuration in $\Lambda_k \setminus \partial_- \Lambda_k$ after the topplings at

$$y_1, \dots, y_{m_1}, z_1, \dots, z_{n_1}, \dots y_{m_{k-1}+1}, \dots, y_{m_k}, z_{n_{k-1}+1}, \dots, z_{n_k}$$

coincides with the stabilization of $\mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\zeta_1) + \zeta_2$ in $\Lambda_k \setminus \partial_- \Lambda_k$. This yields the claim. ☐

Lemma 6. *Let* $\gamma > 0$.
(i) If $\eta \in \mathcal{X}$ *satisfies* $\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G^{(\gamma)}(x,y)\eta_y < \infty$ *for all* $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$*, then* η *is* γ*-stabilizable.*
(ii) With $\mathbb{P}$*-probability* 1*, for any* $\eta_0 \in \Omega^{(\gamma)}$ *and any* $t \ge 0$*,* $\eta_0 + N_t^{\varphi}$ *is* γ*-stabilizable.*

Proof. (i) By (1.2),

$$\Delta_\Lambda^{(\gamma)} N_\Lambda^{(\gamma)} = \eta - \mathcal{S}_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}(\eta) \le \eta.$$

Hence, by (1.11)

$$\sup_\Lambda (N_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}\eta)_x \le \sup_\Lambda \sum_{y \in \Lambda} G_\Lambda^{(\gamma)}(x,y)\eta_y \le \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} G^{(\gamma)}(x,y)\eta_y < \infty. \tag{3.2}$$

(ii) Due to the boundedness of φ and estimate (1.11), the configuration $\eta_0 + N_t^{\varphi}$ satisfies the condition in part (i) for all $t \ge 0$, with probability 1. ☐

Due to Lemmas 5 and 6, the process

$$\eta_t = \mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\eta_0 + N_t^{\varphi}). \tag{3.3}$$

is well-defined for any initial configuration $\eta_0 \in \Omega^{(\gamma)}$. The computation in (3.2) also gives that the addition operators

$$a_x^{(\gamma)}\eta := \mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\eta + \delta_x) = \lim_{\Lambda} \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda}^{(\gamma)}(\eta + \delta_x)$$

are defined for any $\eta \in \Omega^{(\gamma)}$, $\gamma > 0$.

Recall that $n_{\Lambda}^{(\gamma)}(x, y, \eta_0)$ denotes the number of topplings occurring at y in computing $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda}^{(\gamma)}(\eta_0 + \delta_x)$. We also define $n^{(\gamma)}(x, y, \eta_0) := \sup_{\Lambda} n_{\Lambda}^{(\gamma)}(x, y, \eta_0)$ and the avalanche started at x (in Λ and in $\mathbb{Z}^d$) by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Av}_{\Lambda,x}^{(\gamma)}(\eta) &= \{y \in \Lambda : n_{\Lambda}^{(\gamma)}(x, y, \eta) \geq 1\} \\ \mathrm{Av}_{x}^{(\gamma)}(\eta) &= \{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d : n^{(\gamma)}(x, y, \eta) \geq 1\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Lemma 7. *Let* $\gamma > 0$.
(i) We have $m^{(\gamma)}\left(|\mathrm{Av}_x^{(\gamma)}| < \infty\right) = 1$.
(ii) The transformation $a_x^{(\gamma)}$ *leaves* $m^{(\gamma)}$ *invariant.*

Proof. Take η_0 distributed according to $m^{(\gamma)}$. Due to (1.9),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{m^{(\gamma)}}[n^{(\gamma)}(x, y, \eta_0)] &= \lim_{\Lambda} \mathbb{E}_{m^{(\gamma)}}[n_{\Lambda}^{(\gamma)}(x, y, \eta_0)] \\ &= \lim_{\Lambda} \lim_{V} \mathbb{E}_{m_V^{(\gamma)}}[n_{\Lambda}^{(\gamma)}(x, y, \eta_0)] \\ &\leq \lim_{V} \mathbb{E}_{m_V^{(\gamma)}}[n_{V}^{(\gamma)}(x, y, \eta_0)] \\ &= G^{(\gamma)}(x, y). \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Inequality (3.5) and the estimates (1.11), (1.10) imply $\mathbb{E}_{m^{(\gamma)}}|\mathrm{Av}_x^{(\gamma)}(\eta)| < \infty$, for any x, implying (i). By a simple argument [8, Section 4], (i) implies (ii). ☐

Theorem 2. *Let* $\gamma > 0$.
(i) The process $\{\eta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ *is Markovian.*
(ii) With $\mathbb{P}$*-probability* 1*, for any* $\eta_0 \in \Omega^{(\gamma)}$ *we have*

$$\eta_t = \lim_{V} \prod_{x \in V} \left(a_x^{(\gamma)}\right)^{N_{x,t}^{\varphi}}(\eta_0).$$

(iii) If η_0 *is distributed according to* $m^{(\gamma)}$ *then* $\{\eta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ *is stationary.*

Proof. (i) By (3.3), for $0 \leq t \leq t + s$, and $\eta_0 \in \Omega^{(\gamma)}$, η_t and η_{t+s} are well-defined, and $\eta_0 + N_t^{\varphi}$, $\eta_0 + N_{t+s}^{\varphi}$ are γ-stabilizable by Lemma 6 (ii). By Lemma 5(iv), we have

$$\eta_{t+s} = \mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\eta_0 + N_{t+s}^{\varphi}) = \mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\eta_t + N_{t+s}^{\varphi} - N_t^{\varphi}), \qquad s \geq 0.$$

This implies the Markov property.

(ii) Condition on a realization of the Poisson processes such that for all $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} N^{\varphi}_{x,t} G^{(\gamma)}(x,y) < \infty$. Let $x_1, x_2, \dots$ be an enumeration of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, and let

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_n &= \eta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} N^{\varphi}_{x_i,t} \delta_{x_i}; \\ \eta &= \eta_0 + N^{\varphi}_t; \\ \zeta_n &= \mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\eta_n) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(a^{(\gamma)}_{x_i} \right)^{N^{\varphi}_{x_i,t}} (\eta_0) \\ \zeta &= \mathcal{S}^{(\gamma)}(\eta). \end{aligned}$$

Note that ζ is indeed well-defined by Lemma 6(ii). Given $W \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ finite, select Λ such that $(N^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda \eta)_y = (N^{(\gamma)} \eta)_y$ for all $y \in \overline{W}$. If $n \geq n_0(\Lambda)$, we have $\eta_n = \eta$ in Λ, and therefore

$$(N^{(\gamma)} \eta)_y = (N^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda \eta)_y = (N^{(\gamma)}_\Lambda \eta_n)_y \leq (N^{(\gamma)} \eta_n)_y \leq (N^{(\gamma)} \eta)_y, \qquad y \in \overline{W},$$

where the first inequality is due to Lemma 5(ii), and the second to Lemma 5(i). This shows that $(\zeta_n)_y = \zeta_y$ for $y \in W$, when $n \geq n_0(\Lambda)$. Hence $\zeta_n \to \zeta$, proving (ii).

(iii) Due to Lemma 7(ii), and part (ii), η_t is an almost sure limit of configurations distributed according to $m^{(\gamma)}$. This completes the proof. $\square$

We now consider the dynamics in the case $\gamma = 0$. For the discrete model, this was constructed in [8]. Due to the observations in Section 1.3, the discrete construction immediately implies the following statements for the continuous model.

Theorem 3. *Let $\gamma = 0$ and $d \geq 3$.*
(i) For $m^{(0)}$-a.e. η_0, the configuration $\eta_0 + \delta_x$ is 0-stabilizable for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.
(ii) $a^{(0)}_x$ leaves $m^{(0)}$ invariant for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.
(iii) Assume that φ satisfies $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \varphi(x) G^{(0)}(x,0) < \infty$. Then $m^{(0)} \otimes \mathbb{P}$-a.s., the limit

$$\eta_t = \lim_{V} \prod_{x \in V} \left(a^{(0)}_x \right)^{N^{\varphi}_{x,t}} \eta_0$$

exists, and equals $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(\eta_0 + N^{\varphi}_t)$.

We denote $m := m^{(0)}$, $G(\cdot,\cdot) := G^{(0)}(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $\mathrm{Av}_x(\eta) := \mathrm{Av}^{(0)}_x(\eta)$.

4 Zero dissipation limit of the stationary processes

Let φ be an addition rate such that

$$\sum_{x} \varphi(x) G(x,y) < \infty \tag{4.1}$$

for all $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Let $\eta_t^{(\gamma)}$ denote the stationary process obtained from starting from $\eta_0^{(\gamma)} := \eta^{(\gamma)}$ distributed according to $m^{(\gamma)}$, addition according to independent Poisson processes with rate $\varphi(x)$ at $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and stabilizing with dissipation γ. Similarly, let η_t denote the process starting from $\eta_0 = \eta$ distributed according to m, addition according to independent Poisson processes with rate $\varphi(x)$ at $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and stabilizing without dissipation, i.e., with $\gamma = 0$.

Theorem 4. *The process* $\eta_t^{(\gamma)}$ *converges weakly in path space to* η_t.

We need the following two lemmas.

Lemma 8. *Suppose that* $0 \le \gamma' < \gamma$. *Then*
(i) $N^{(\gamma)}(\eta) \le N^{(\gamma')}(\eta)$;
(ii) $\mathrm{Av}_0\gamma(\eta) \subseteq \mathrm{Av}_0(\eta)$.

Proof. (i) Consider an exhaustive sequence $y_1, y_2, \dots$ of γ-legal topplings for η. We show that the same sequence is γ'-legal for η. Since y_1 is γ-unstable in η, it is also γ'-unstable. After its γ-toppling let us add height $\gamma - \gamma' > 0$ at y_1. This has the same effect as if we performed a γ'-toppling, and the added extra height does not affect γ-legality of the sequence. Adding similarly after each γ-toppling shows that $y_1, y_2, \dots$ is γ'-legal, and (i) follows by the remarks preceding Lemma 5.

(ii) This follows immediately from (i). ☐

Lemma 9. *Suppose that* $\gamma_n \downarrow 0$. *Then for* m*-a.e.* η,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} a_0^{(\gamma_n)}(\eta) = a_0^{(0)}(\eta). \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. We have

$$m(|\mathrm{Av}_0^{(0)}(\eta)| < \infty) = 1; \tag{4.3}$$

see [8, Theorem 3.11]. Also, $m(\eta_x \notin \{0, 1, \dots, 2d-1\},\ x \in \mathbb{Z}^d) = 1$. On the intersection of the two events we have $N^{(\gamma_n)}(\eta) \to N^{(0)}(\eta)$, which together with $\Delta^{(\gamma_n)} \to \Delta^{(0)}$ implies the statement. ☐

Proof of Theorem 4. Recall the definition (1.5) of the metric on $[0, 2d+\gamma)^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$, that is

$$\mathrm{dist}(\eta, \zeta) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} 2^{-|x|} \min\{|\eta_x - \zeta_x|, 1\}$$

As a first step, for a given $\delta > 0$, we will prove that for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a coupling $\mathcal{M}^{(\gamma)}$ of $m^{(\gamma)}$ and m such that, in this coupling, with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$,

$$\mathrm{dist}(a_0^{(\gamma)}(\eta^1), a_0^{(\gamma)}(\eta^2)) \le \delta \tag{4.4}$$

This will allow us to deal with the convergence of the processes for addition rates with finite support.

First, for given $\delta, \epsilon > 0$, we choose V large enough such that if η, ζ agree on V, then $\mathrm{dist}(\eta,\zeta) < \delta$, and such that

$$m\left(|\overline{\mathrm{Av}_0(\eta)}| \not\subseteq V\right) \leq \epsilon \tag{4.5}$$

Such a choice of V is possible, since avalanches are finite with m-probability one by (4.3). By Lemma 8(ii), we then have the same estimate (4.5) for $\mathrm{Av}_0^{(\gamma)}(\eta)$.

Since $m^{(\gamma)} \to m$ weakly, and restrictions to finite volumes $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ of $m^{(\gamma)}$ and m are absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, by [15, Proposition 1] we have the existence of $\gamma_0 > 0$ such that for all $\gamma < \gamma_0$ there exists a coupling $\mathcal{M}^{(\gamma)}$ of $m^{(\gamma)}$ and m such that

$$\mathcal{M}^{(\gamma)}(\eta^1_x = \eta^2_x,\ \forall x \in V) \geq 1 - \epsilon \tag{4.6}$$

In the coupling $\mathcal{M}^{(\gamma)}$ we then have, by (4.5)

$$\left(a_0^{(\gamma)}(\eta^1)\right)_y = \left(a_0^{(\gamma)}(\eta^2)\right)_y$$

for all $y \in V$, with probability at least $1 - 3\epsilon$. Therefore, the probability that the distance $\mathrm{dist}(a_0^{(\gamma)}(\eta^1), a_0^{(\gamma)}(\eta^2))$ is larger that δ is smaller than 3ϵ.

So far, we can conclude that

$$a_0^{(\gamma)}(\eta^{(\gamma)}) \to a_0^{(\gamma)}(\eta^0)$$

weakly as $\gamma \to 0$. By Lemma 9, $a_0^{(\gamma)}(\eta) \to a_0(\eta)$ for m-a.e. η. Hence we have

$$a_0^{(\gamma)}(\eta^{(\gamma)}) \to a_0(\eta^0) \tag{4.7}$$

weakly as $\gamma \to 0$.

Analogously, using finiteness of avalanches, we conclude that for any finite set $B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, and natural numbers $n_x, x \in B$, we have

$$\prod_{x\in B} (a_x^{(\gamma)})^{n_x}(\eta^{(\gamma)}) \to \prod_{x \in B} a_x^{n_x}(\eta^0) \tag{4.8}$$

weakly, as $\gamma \to 0$.

Therefore, we have convergence of the processes $\eta_t^{(\gamma)} \to \eta_t$ for addition rates with finite support, i.e., such that $\varphi(x) = 0$ for $x \notin D$ with $D \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ finite.

The next step is to pass to general addition rates; we use the convergence of semigroups argument, as in the proof of [11, Proposition 4.1].

Let $S_t^{\varphi,\gamma}$ denote the semigroup of the process $\eta_t^{(\gamma)}$ with addition rate φ, and S_t^φ the semigroup of the process η_t (with zero dissipation) with addition rate φ. Both semigroups are well-defined as long as φ has finite support.

For a local function f, with dependence set D_f, and for addition rates φ, φ' of finite support, we have the estimate (51) in the proof of [11, Proposition 4.1]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{m^{(\gamma)}} |S_t^{\varphi,\gamma}(f) - S_t^{\varphi',\gamma}(f)| &\leq Ct \sum_{x \in \overline{D_f}} \sum_y G^{(\gamma)}(x,y) |\varphi(y) - \varphi'(y)| \\ &\leq Ct \sum_{x \in \overline{D_f}} \sum_y G(x,y) |\varphi(y) - \varphi'(y)|\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_m |S_t^{\varphi}(f) - S_t^{\varphi'}(f)| \leq Ct \sum_{x \in \overline{D_f}} \sum_y G(x,y) |\varphi(y) - \varphi'(y)| \tag{4.9}$$

Note that this estimate in [11] is given in the context of a model with discrete heights. However, it is based only on the estimate (1.10) for the numbers of topplings, which is valid for the continuous height model, and therefore it extends directly to the continuous height model.

Hence, if for a sequence $\varphi^{(n)}$ of addition rates of finite support, for an addition rate φ (not necessarily of finite support) and for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$

$$\sum_y G(x,y) |\varphi(y) - \varphi^{(n)}(y)| \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$, we conclude for all local f, $\gamma \geq 0$, $S_t^{\varphi^{(n)},\gamma}(f)$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^1(m^{(\gamma)})$, and hence converges to $\Psi := S_t^{\varphi,\gamma}(f)$ for all $\gamma \geq 0$, as $n \to \infty$. This semigroup $S_t^{\varphi,\gamma}$ then defines a corresponding stationary Markov process $\eta_t^{\varphi,(\gamma)}$, and η_t^{φ} (for $\gamma = 0$).

As the convergence of the semigroups implies the weak convergence of the corresponding stationary processes, we conclude for all $\gamma > 0$,

$$\eta_t^{\varphi^{(n)},\gamma} \to \eta_t^{\varphi,\gamma} \tag{4.10}$$

and

$$\eta_t^{\varphi^{(n)}} \to \eta_t^{\varphi} \tag{4.11}$$

weakly on path space as $n \to \infty$.

Therefore, if φ satisfies (4.1), let $\varphi^{(n)}$ denote $\varphi^{(n)}(x) = \varphi(x) I(x \in [-n,n]^d)$, then we have for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\eta_t^{\varphi^{(n)},\gamma} \to \eta_t^{\varphi^{(n)}} \tag{4.12}$$

as $\gamma \to 0$. Combination of (4.10),(4.11),(4.12) together with a three epsilon argument then concludes the proof. □

Acknowledgements. We thank Hermann Thorisson for indicating us reference [15]. F.R., E.S. thank Carleton University and E.S. thanks Leiden University for financial support and hospitality. Part of this work was done during the stay of F.R., E.S. at Institut Henri Poincaré, Centre Emile Borel (whose financial support and hospitality are acknowledged) for the semester "Interacting Particle Systems, Statistical Mechanics and Probability Theory".

References

[1] Athreya, S.R. and Járai, A.A.: Infinite volume limit for the stationary distribution of Abelian sandpile models. Commun. Math. Phys. **249**, 197-213 (2004). An erratum for this paper appeared in Comm. Math. Phys. **264**, 843 (2006) with an electronic supplemental material.

[2] Azimi-Tafreshi, N., Lotfi, E. and Moghimi-Araghi, S.: Continuous Abelian Sandpile Model in Two Dimensional Lattice. Preprint (2007). `arXiv:0710.3292v2`

[3] Bak, P., Tang, K. and Wiesefeld, K.: Self-organized criticality. Phys. Rev. A **38**, 364-374 (1988).

[4] Benjamini, I., Lyons, R., Peres, Y. and Schramm, O.: Uniform spanning forests. Ann. Probab. **29** 1–65 (2001).

[5] Dhar D.: Self organized critical state of sandpile automaton models. Phys. Rev. Letters **64**, 1613-1616 (1990).

[6] Gabrielov, A.: Abelian avalanches and Tutte polynomials. Physica A **195**, 253–274 (1993).

[7] Járai, A.A. and Lyons, R.: Ladder sandpiles. Markov Process. Related Fields **13**, 493–518 (2007).

[8] Járai, A.A., Redig, F. Infinite volume limit of the Abelian sandpile model in dimensions $d \geq 3$. Prob. Th. Rel. Fields **141**, 181–212 (2008).

[9] Lawler, G.F.: *Intersections of random walks.* Birkhäuser, softcover edition (1996).

[10] Lyons, R.: Determinantal probability measures. Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **98**, 167–212 (2003).

[11] Maes, C., Redig, F. and Saada, E.: The Abelian sandpile model on an infinite tree. Ann. Probab. **30**, 2081–2107 (2002).

[12] Maes, C., Redig, F. and Saada, E.: The infinite volume limit of dissipative Abelian sandpiles. Commun. Math. Phys. **244**, 395–417 (2004).

[13] Mahieu, S., Ruelle, P.: Scaling fields in the two-dimensional abelian sandpile model. Phys. Rev E **64**, (1–19) (2001).

[14] Majumdar, S.N. and Dhar, D.: Equivalence between the Abelian sandpile model and the $q \to 0$ limit of the Potts model. Physica A **185**, 129–145 (1992).

[15] Thorisson, H.: On coupling and convergence in density and in distribution. Preprint (2008).

[16] Tsuchiya, V.T., Katori, M.: Proof of breaking of self-organized criticality in a nonconservative abelian sandpile model. Phys. Rev. E **61**, 1183-1188 (2000).

[17] Wilson, D.B.: Generating random spanning trees more quickly than the cover time. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, 296–303; ACM, New York (1996).